

CAZON
DG705
-1135

Government
Publications

ONTARIO COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

OPEN MEETING WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

JUNE 7, 1975

<u>INDEX</u>	<u>ITEM</u>
5-0149	Location, Time
5-0150	Attendance
5-0151	Introductory Remarks
5-0152	Formula Revision
5-0153	Accessability
5-0154	Tuition Fees
5-0155	Student Support
5-0156	Graduate Studies
5-0157	System-Wide Coordination
5-0158	Macro-Indicators
5-0159	Financial Outlook
	i) Incremental Costs of Off-Campus Instruction
	ii) Faculty Complements
	iii) Capital Consumption
	iv) General
Appendix 'A'	President's Introductory Remarks
Appendix 'B'	APUO Comments



ONTARIO COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

MEETING

OPEN MEETING WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

5-0149	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>DATE AND TIME</u>
	University of Ottawa	June 7, 1975 10:15 a.m.
5-0150	<u>ATTENDANCE</u>	

OCUA MEMBERS

J. S. Dupré

M. A. B. Bush	W. A. Goyan
A. D'Iorio	T. Giesbrecht
P. D. Fleck	D. G. Hill
R. Gerstein	A. L. McCallion
L. Good	H. H. Walker

OCUA STAFF

J. P. Venton Executive Secretary	N. E. Simmons Associate Secretary
-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA DELEGATION

Rev. R. Guindon Rector	Dr. M. Chagnon Vice-Rector (Academic)
Dr. A. Gillmore Vice-Rector (Administration)	Dr. P. Camu Chairman Board of Governors
Dr. J. Grace Board of Governors	Miss M. Sayer Dean, School of Nursing

Mr. A. Hubbard
Dean, Common Law

Dr. M. Beillard
Secretary, Faculty of
Social Sciences

Dr. D. Sayne
Director, Department of
Biochemistry

Dr. R. Tross
President, A.P.U.O.

Mr. J. McCarthy
Assistant Vice-Rector
Financial Services

Dr. H. Moeller
Head Librarian

Mr. B. Boss
Director, Public Relations

Mr G. Van Schoenberg
Secretary, School of
Graduate Studies

Mr. T. Sacombe
Assistant Vice-Rector
Student Services

Dr. J. Joly
Assistant Vice-Rector
Institutional Research and
Planning

5-0151

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The Rector circulated and reviewed comparative information for the period 1972-73 to 1974-75 concerning finances, enrolment, faculty and staff. A copy of the Rector's remarks is appended.

The President of the Faculty Association (APUO) commented on the salary situation. A copy of his comments is also appended.

Discussion focused on the following:

5-0152

FORMULA REIVISION

The University's recommendation for formula revision was considered to address itself both to the equitable distribution of funds and to removal of slip year. The delegation recognised that were its proposal used in a global financing situation the resultant BIU value would have less effectiveness in offsetting inflation than would a BIU value derived under the current formula. The University did not feel that the mechanism for allocation of grants should be determined by the level of global funding.

With regard to student weight changes, the delegation suggested that requests in this regard not be considered piece-meal but rather that Council periodically review all weights to ensure relative appropriateness. The University did not indicate any interest in adopting a common weight for undergraduates in Arts and Science.

5-0153

ACCESSIBILITY

The delegation described how over the years Ottawa had proven attractive to students from lower income groups. However the University did not feel that it had gone as far as possible in this regard noting that post-secondary students from lower income families were often attracted to training which would result in early graduation and good expectations for subsequent employment. Hence, it was felt that colleges of applied arts and technology were often preferred by these students.

The Board of Governors had expressed concern about the growing uniformity of Ontario universities. It was felt that the University of Ottawa was primarily characterized by its francophone offerings and the orientation of students.

It was noted that in professional school admissions Ottawa gave preference to its own graduates and students from the region provided they were academically on par with other applicants. This practice was a result of the historically higher record of acceptances among regional applicants.

The delegation noted that accessibility and selection processes would be improved if comparability of secondary school records were possible.

As well, it was felt that industry should be encouraged to assume additional financial support in recognition of the benefits derived from university education.

5-0154

TUITION FEES

Under existing arrangements Ottawa would not be inclined to raise its tuition fees primarily because of the social and cultural effects such an increase would have through discouraging students from lower income groups. However, the delegation indicated that it would reconsider this position if non-loan student support became available to those from lower income families.

At present Ottawa offered free tuition to employee dependants, representing in the neighbourhood of \$100,000 per annum.

5-0155

STUDENT SUPPORT

In the discussion of student support it was noted that the Quebec student aid programme gave recognition to the levels of tuition and residence fees in its assessment of need. Therefore, it was considered safe to assume, in theory, that if the University of Ottawa were to increase tuition fees, the Quebec programme could accommodate

such changes. The question was raised as to whether this was in fact true.

5-0156

GRADUATE STUDIES

The delegation stressed that 'graduate education should be the core of excellence in a university' and that Ontario should play a lead role in terms of the discovery of knowledge and the development of the country.

Dissatisfaction was expressed with the indirect mechanisms through which graduate studies had been reduced. The delegation agreed that confluence must exist between an appropriately sized graduate effort in the Province and the ability to meet the costs of such an effort. It was stressed that graduate proliferation had not occurred in the system, especially in comparison with the growth in undergraduate offerings, and that indeed a greater graduate effort would be appropriate. Ottawa did not feel that universities had manipulated student enrolment in graduate studies in order to receive higher operating grants.

5-0157

SYSTEM-WIDE COORDINATION

The delegation expressed interest in the role of the National Library in coordinating library activities across the country. It was felt that the OULCS catalogue support system might be considered prohibitively costly and elaborate beyond the needs of the universities. The National Library's catalogue system (CAN/MARC) was viewed to be simpler, less expensive, and able to satisfy the University of Ottawa's foreseeable needs. Ottawa's experience to date with university library coordination endeavours had been characterized by delays in obtaining data and insufficient communication.

5-0158

MACRO-INDICATORS

The question was raised as to whether it was possible to measure productivity in a university regardless of the mechanism chosen and the delegation suggested that Council, in considering macro-indicators, keep in mind the extensive information already

available in the university system.

5-0159

FINANCIAL OUTLOOK

i) Incremental Costs of Off-campus Instruction

Ottawa's off-campus instruction had always been undertaken in response to requests. In the current financial situation the University was finding it more difficult to continue such regional offerings and had recently turned down a number of requests of this type. Two significant problems encountered were the wish to use regular full-time faculty rather than part-time and the resultant need to enlarge full-time faculty complements. In view of the time consumed in travel to off-campus centres etc., the BIUs generated by part-time students were not considered adequate to meet additional faculty costs. Another problem noted by the delegation was space rental in off-campus locations for which additional funds were not available.

Difficulties in extending off-campus services were exacerbated by slip year. The delegation felt that a split-BIU mechanism would only permit Ottawa to mount additional off-campus courses if the amount of global funding was adequate.

ii) Faculty Complements

It was noted that in the last two to three years the University of Ottawa had experienced a 6-7% turnover in faculty. Previously this proportion had been higher. The recent reduction in turnover was felt to reflect diminished faculty mobility.


iii) Capital Consumption


The delegation stressed that total revenue to the University had not been sufficient to maintain equipment etc. While earmarking of funds to relieve capital consumption was not considered desirable, the delegation stressed that global operating funds needed to be increased to take this situation into account.

iv) General

The delegation noted that the differential between budgeted results and actual operating results in the university system as a whole amounted, on the average, to only approximately 2%, and concluded that this did not warrant questions of credibility.

The Chairman of the Board concluded the Hearing by expressing his feeling that the University of Ottawa had reached the limit in trying to meet Government objectives within available resources. The Board was now satisfied that the University administration was extending every effort possible in this regard and stressed its need to know Government's intentions for the university system in the future.


.....
N. E. Simmons
Associate Secretary


.....
J. S. Dupré
Chairman

June 7, 1975

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS FOR THE PRESENTATION
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA BRIEF TO OCUA

This year marks the 10th anniversary of our entering into the "family of provincially-assisted institutions" as Leslie Frost used to say. We have been dealt with generously during those years and by that I mean that we have received our fair share of generous public funds. We have had some differences of opinion on certain problems. These have never been on basic policy issues; but on certain administrative implementations of the policies, we have "grinned and borne". We feel we ought to have started a few years ago to identify more clearly the factual impact of the funding decisions of the Legislature as well as of the decisions of the Ministry with regard to the distribution of the different elements of the funding mechanisms such as the basic formula and the supplementary grants. Our main concern here is that our own responsible planning and perhaps even our success in this regard has pushed us into a situation in which we have no alternative but to eat our capital.

Rather than trying to summarize our written presentation which you have had the opportunity to read before this meeting, and about which we shall try to answer any question you might want to raise, I thought it might be appropriate if my introductory remarks were limited to a few comments focussing on the attached Table of Comparative Information 1972-1975.

1. TOTAL OPERATING INCOME

The year 1971-72 was not used in the attached Table of Comparative Information because it was only a 10-month year for funding purposes and therefore does not constitute a valid comparison with either the previous or the following years relative to total government expenditures --or university revenues.

The establishment of slip-year financing in 1973-74, as can be seen in the first three columns of the Table, further reduced the base for the following years.

The increase in 1974-75--and the total increase over those three years--must be interpreted in the light of:

- a) the substantial rate of inflation and
- b) the slip-year financing (note the arrows).

In point of fact, as is evident in the Table, the increase in revenues (column I) over those three years has not been applied to increase our complement of teaching or support staff (columns 5-6-7 and 8-9).

The members of OCUA should realize that the figures used in this column for 1972-73 and 1973-74 are taken from the COFO report for those years. Comparable figures for 1974-75 are not yet available. We have given for that year our best estimate (pre-audit and pre-adjustment) at the time of preparing this Brief. They are, therefore, subject to change.

During those years, the total salary mass for all staffs has increased by 24.6%. The fringe benefits mass by 40.1%. The total salary mass for part-time by 23.5%. The other expenditures by 23.4%. The result is a total increase in expenditures of 25.3%. Further explanations will be given later.

II. BIU AND FTE:

These columns give a striking example of the effect of slip-year financing in a "growing" university.

An important factor which explains in part the difference between the 8.4% increase in the number of BIU

and the 16.9% increase in FTE students is that our enrolment in graduate studies has decreased from 1051 FT in 1972 to 995 FT in 1974 while our enrolment in undergraduate programs has substantially increased.

III. FULL-TIME TEACHING STAFF:

We have provided three columns in order to identify some of the problems in using the so-called Macro-indicators.

Our Faculty of Medicine has not increased its intake of M.D. students during that period. The number of interns and residents has increased slightly. A new affiliated teaching hospital has come on stream, the Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario, and this has required the addition of GFT teaching staff. If we exclude the Faculty of Medicine, the % increase in our full-time teaching staff from 1972-73 to 1974-75 is reduced from 3.7% to 2.7%..

With the rapid expansion of the University in the sixties, the number of full-time members of the teaching staff who are eligible for sabbaticals has also increased during those years. If we further exclude those who are on sabbatical and other leaves, we find that the number of full-time members of the teaching staff actually on campus has been at a little less than zero growth since 1972. ⁽¹⁾

(1) The former Ottawa Teachers' College which has been integrated to our Faculty of Education on September 1, 1974, and which is on "line-budget" has been excluded from the table of Comparative Information (29 members of the teaching staff and 157 students).

While it is only a very "gross" proxy for assessing the so-called increase in productivity, the F.T.Student/F.T.Teaching Staff ratio for those three years shows an 11.6% increase which is not bad! If one were to consider only the members of the teaching staff on campus exclusive of Medicine it would be even greater (12.1/1; 13.2/1; 14.1/1) 16.66%.

F.T.Student/F.T.Teaching Staff

1972-73	8,692/869	= 10/1
1973-74	9,430/881	= 10.7/1 (7%)
1974-75	10,058/901	= 11.16/1 (11.6%)

Of course no institution can serve 1,366 more F.T. (1,885.7 FTE) students without doing something. During that period, the total amount of our budget allocated to part-time teaching (i.e. from outside the University, additional teaching load for a certain number of our own staff, teaching assistantships to graduate students) has increased from an initial budget of \$3,360,000 for 1972-73 to an initial budget for 1974-75 of \$4,467,000.

Without wanting to discuss this in any detail we are convinced that the fact that part-time teaching is "less costly" is not, by itself, a good indicator that, academically, this course of action maintains--let alone improves--the level or quality of service!

IV. FULL-TIME SUPPORT STAFF:

What has been said about the teaching staff applies also to the support staff which represents the other portion of the close to 80% of our budget which is spent on salaries.

The presence of an increased number of students generates an increased workload for all staffs of the institution. The comparison between the 16.9% increase in FTE students and the 2.5% and 0.6% of annually paid and hourly paid support staff is quite striking.

Another factor contributing to the workload of the support staff has been the 59.7% increase in gross ⁽¹⁾ square footage--excluding the off-campus rented properties--during the same years.

These are almost incredible figures but they are facts! In order to be able to balance our budgets we have had, among other things, to contract out to outside firms the cleaning of most of our new buildings. The COFO annual reports for 1973 and 1974 show the % of our total expenditures allocated for external contracted services as four times the average % for the system.

From 3% in 1968-69 to 38% in 1971-72, we have now reached

(1) Similar figures would be obtained on the basis of "net" or "not assignable".

the point at which 80% of our cleaning is done by outside firms. Once again we have a "less costly" operation because outside contractors tend to pay the minimum salaries permitted by law together with as few fringe benefits as possible. It is highly questionable whether we have, in the process, maintained--let alone improved--the level of service that existed.

V. STUDENT/STAFF RATIO AS INDEX OF PRODUCTIVITY:

We have reached the point at which we cannot remain silent when the Government and the Ministry blame the universities of the Province for having failed, during the last few years, to improve their so-called "productivity" in the delivery of educational services. The blame is general. It is not specifically directed at this University nor does it exclude it. Without in any way assuming a "holier than thou" attitude, we want to set the record straight. Since the student/staff ratio is the main thrust of the allegation, then the allegation is wrong if applied to the University of Ottawa.

We are not privy to the analysis upon which is based the statement of the Minister to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. But surely, at this University, it is simply not true that "increased revenue on account of more students is consumed by increased staff and faculty". It is also simply not true that

"the ratio of students to faculty has remained sensibly constant during the past few years" (Report to OECD, p.172).

The "bilingual" programs understandably slightly lowers our ratio. Even at that, our ratio is higher than that obtained in the universities of the United Kingdom, as you well know.

VI. OUR "RESERVES"

Let us turn now to another line of reasoning which has been officially adopted by the Minister to "rationalize" the decisions that have been made by the Legislature, namely the existence of "reserves" in the audited statements of the universities. Here are the facts with respect to the University of Ottawa.

Some years ago we made the decision to control our expenditures in such a way as to set aside a fund that would help us to gradually assume the operating costs of a group of buildings under construction which, by their very nature, would not increase our capacity to register more students. These were the Library, the University Centre, the Power Plant and the Physical Education building whose facilities would be used by the whole campus for sports and recreation. Other campuses of similar size and mix had had similar facilities for years. These have come on stream, along with other buildings, since 1972.

We had advised the Ministry of our decision. We had even been congratulated for responsible planning.

Under the present circumstances, we have no alternative but to use these reserves to balance our budget in 1975-76, which is a much shorter period than had been planned. The congratulations of a few years ago have turned sour and responsible planning goes out the window.

There is another related aspect of this problem which we want to put before you for the first time. It has occurred to us--eventhough we have never been formally advised--that the very presence of the above mentioned carry-over had something to do with the decisions that have been made over the years with respect to the funding of the supplementary costs of bilingualism. We know that your Council has not had time to look seriously into that matter and that you have already expressed your concern at the lack of rationale which seems to have presided over the allocations of these grants. We would be very grateful if, after having checked the record, you could establish that such considerations have not been the cause of our receiving a grant far below our conservative estimates of the real extra-costs of bilingualism. These had been determined on the basis of a methodology that was established jointly by the Ministry and this University. At the very least, we would urge that in the future these two problems be treated on their respective merit.

VIII. SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR BILINGUALISM:

It will come as no surprise to you if we still claim that our supplementary grant for bilingualism ought to have been in the order of three million dollars based on the estimates we presented to you last December. This amount, as you know, is only twice the amount recovered by the Province from the Federal Government for our teaching in the language of the minority. We are as well aware as anybody of the constitutional distribution of power and specifically of the provincial responsibility and authority in educational matters and in this one in particular. If, on the other hand, we ever had had any doubts about the seriousness of the provincial government's commitment towards the Franco-Ontarians, these doubts would have been dispelled by a quick look at the way the other bilingual institutions have been in the past, are now and will be treated in 1975-76. Each one of them--except the University of Ottawa--has received and will receive at least twice, at times much more than twice, the amount recovered by the Province from the Secretary of State. Let me stress once again that I do recognize the authority of the Province to determine the amount of those grants. I do not in any way claim that the other institutions receive too much! How would I know? My only claim is that we do not receive enough, either absolutely or relatively. And I go one

step further. I respectfully suggest that the Province could easily challenge the validity and the adequacy of the 10% of the eligible operating costs of teaching in the language of the minority upon which the Federal Government has based its contribution as recommended by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. It could be that another % would emerge from a serious analysis of the real costs involved in the implementation of the Federal and Provincial policy of fostering the education in the language of the minority.

With due respect and deference, we have to say that the 10% increase over last year's supplementary grant for bilingualism, which your Council has recommended and that the Minister has accepted, has, in fact, imposed upon the whole University even greater restrictions than was the case in the previous year in order to fulfill our mandate "to further bilingualism and biculturalism and to preserve and develop French culture in Ontario" (University of Ottawa Act, 1965, section 4(c)). It is of no great comfort to anyone that if the previous year's grant had been perceived as "over-generous" a 10% could have brought it back into line with the inflation factor. But such was not the case!

1972-73 to 1974-75 COMPARATIVE INFORMATION

Fiscal Year	Total Operating Income (1) (\$ Thousands)	B.I.U.'s for Funding	Students		Full-Time Teaching Staff		Full-Time Support Staff		Gross Square Footage (Excluding Rented Properties)
			F.I.E.	F.T.	Total	Excluding Medicine	On Campus	Annual Salaried	
								Hourly Wage	
1972-73	39,848	20,416.0	11,136.5	8,692	869	731	667	1,280	1,722,437
1973-74 (2)	43,255	20,684.4	12,249.9	9,430	881	741	666	1,280	2,452,976
1974-75 (2)(5)	48,545 (3)	22,134.8	13,022.2	10,058	901	751	665	1,312	2,750,791
Total	<u>21.8%</u>	<u>8.4%</u>	<u>16.9%</u>	<u>15.7%</u>	<u>3.7%</u>	<u>2.7%</u>	<u>(.3%)</u>	<u>2.5%</u>	<u>59.7%</u>

Page 2

- (1) Total operating income as shown in annual reports prepared by the Committee of Finance Officers - Universities of Ontario
- (2) 1973-74 was first year of 'slip-year' funding by Province
- (3) Total operating income 1974-75 - estimated
- (4) On Campus - total less Medicine, less sabbatical and other leaves
- (5) 1974-75 - excluding Teacher Education - Elgin Street Campus (former Ottawa Teachers' College)

June 7- 1975

APUO COMMENTS ON UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA OCUA BRIEF

The University's brief does not answer directly OCUA's question concerning the university's ability or inability to provide fair and equitable salaries for its teaching staff in relation to comparable employees in the public sector. Indeed the brief may convey the erroneous impression that the University has been successful in achieving fair and equitable salary increases for its staff. Our perception of the actual situation differs from that view.

We agree, of course, that comparison with other Ontario universities is one of the criteria that must be used in determining a fair and equitable academic salary settlement. Some years ago, five particular universities of similar size and mix to our own, were selected for this type of comparison. However, such a comparison cannot be the only criterion or even the best criterion for arriving at a fair salary structure. It can in fact lead to grossly misleading conclusions.

Over the past few years, salary settlements at most major Ontario universities have differed at most by a few tenths of one percent since at the time of salary discussions presidents of the various universities keep in close contact with one another to exchange views and to insure that no serious discrepancies arise in the final salary decisions. If, in such a situation, universities believe themselves unable to grant reasonable salary increases due to financial stringencies, settlements and salary structures at all universities in Ontario could well be comparable and yet academic salaries would be neither fair nor equitable. Such a situation actually exists today in Ontario. In its salary brief to Council, OCUFA pointed out that across Ontario, academic salary scales have lost a good 11% of their real value since 1970/71.

Our own situation at the University of Ottawa mirrors this state of affairs. From July 1971 to July 1974 the CPI increased by 25.2%, while the across-the-board or scale portion of our academic salary increases over that period, compounded, totalled 14.8%. Thus, this portion of the salary adjustments lags 10.4% behind the change in the cost of living over that same period. Hence, a catch-up factor of 9.1% would be required as of July 1974 to restore academic salaries at this university to their July 1971 purchasing power. Accordingly, our salaries could well have kept pace with those at comparison universities, and yet the salary structure on the basis of an inter-university comparison would give a very distorted picture. The purchasing power of our academic salary dollar has in fact declined by almost 10% in just three years.

But inter-university comparisons are not the only yardstick to be applied to determine whether academic salaries are fair. One must clearly also compare these salaries with remunerations paid in other sectors of the economy. Particularly pertinent are, of course, comparisons with other professional groups, especially those paid from public funds. The question posed by Council actually implies such a comparison. Members of Council already know from the OCUFA brief that academic salaries do not fare well in such a comparison. Several examples will perhaps suffice to underscore this point:

(1) Data published by the Department of Labour reflect a real increase in base rates of one-year agreements of approximately 12% (i.e. after correcting for inflation). This represents, then, a corresponding increase in the purchasing power of wages across Canada. No comparable increases were granted by universities so that academic salaries have declined in relative purchasing power by an equivalent amount, i.e. 12% in comparison with these groups. While their educational and professional backgrounds are different from those of academics, both groups must compete in the same market for goods and services.

(2) In its brief submitted to Council, OCUFA concluded that there exists a real gap between university salary scales and those of public employees with comparable professional preparation. OCUFA estimates that this gap is on the order of 16%. To cite just one typical example, an Education Officer I employed by the Government of Ontario is shown in the OCUFA brief to have qualifications comparable to those of an assistant professor. The minimum salary for that rank at our university during the current year is \$12,945 (including Medicine), while that for an Education Officer I is \$17,523, i.e. 35% more than that of the assistant professor. Perhaps a more meaningful comparison would be their average salaries. The average salary of assistant professors at the University of Ottawa is \$17,025. The average assistant professor has about 4 years of relevant experience. An Education Officer I with comparable experience earned \$20,699 last year, i.e. 22% more, not counting any salary increases which these professionals in the Ontario civil service may have received in the interim.

(3) In recent years, university salaries have also been losing ground with respect to teachers in public school systems. This trend has been enormously accelerated in recent months by the very large salary increases granted in Ottawa and other communities. Thus, the present starting salary of a teacher with no previous experience and holding a master's degree is \$3,665 or 36% higher in Ottawa high schools than at the University of Ottawa. A high school teacher with 5 years of relevant experience and holding the Ph.D. now earns \$1,700 or 10% more than his counterpart in this university despite the fact that the latter is under a 12 months contract, while the high school teacher's contract is for less than 10 months. The high school teachers contracts, moreover, contain a cost of living escalation clause which will further accentuate this difference.

(4) Salaries of university teaching staff fare badly even in comparison with those in other Ontario post-secondary institutions falling under the same ministry. Thus scale increases awarded CAAT teachers since September 1973 total 26.3%, while corresponding increases at the University of Ottawa totalled 14.8%, i.e. 11.5% less than the salary increases in the CAATS.

(5) The teaching staff at the University of Ottawa is even losing ground with respect to the support staff at its own institution. Over the past few years, salary increases for the support staff have been somewhat higher, by 1 - 2%, than those of the teaching staff. For the coming year, this difference will be nearly 4%. Gradually, too, the share which academic salaries represent of the total operating budget has been decreasing. In the February 1, 1975, round of salary adjustments, over 9% of the support staff salary mass was spent to bring all support staff personnel to within 10% of the market. The \$520 across-the-board increase given to the teaching staff at the same time represents 2.53% of the salary mass and is considered by the University an advance on the scale increase to be given on July 1st, i.e. not an adjustment to the market. Accordingly, the teaching staff salaries

have lost ground, particularly relative to certain technically qualified members of the support staff, such as laboratory technicians, technical personnel within the Computing Centre, professional librarians, etc.

This adverse shift of academic salaries with respect to other sectors of the economy and in particular the civil service also reflects itself in a shift in starting salaries paid to new appointments at our university in recent years. To cite just one typical example, the average salary of newly appointed associate professors increased from \$16,523 to \$19,917 between 1971/72 and 1974/75, i.e. by 21%. During the same period, the average salary of that rank rose from \$17,956 to \$20,861, i.e. by 16%. These figures would suggest that the salaries of continuing staff in that rank fall behind market rates by at least 5% during this period. Moreover, the minimum salary for that rank for the current year is \$16,650 or \$3,267 less than the average salary paid to new appointments. In 1971/72 this difference was \$2,583. Thus, there was a 26.5% rise in this differential in the past four years, reflecting the rate at which the minimum academic salaries are falling behind the market.

We have tried to show in this supplementary brief that academic salaries at the University of Ottawa and presumably at other Ontario universities cannot be considered fair and equitable. The purchasing power of these salaries has been eroded by about 10% in the past four years. In addition, academics are losing ground with respect to most other sectors of the economy. This increasing gap ranges anywhere from 5% to 40% depending on how the comparison is made, with most reasonable estimates converging at about 15%. This trend is tantamount to the professoriate subsidizing universities in Ontario and is bound to have disastrous long-range effects on the morale and militancy of academic staff, on the calibre of university teachers, and on the quality of instruction.

In his recent convocation address, the Rector very eloquently addressed himself to this same problem. He said, and I quote, "As things stand now, one can almost say that University staff members will be called upon to subsidize the universities (over and above their tax contributions as citizens), because universities cannot afford to give, in many instances, salary increases comparable to those received by their colleagues in other public and para-public institutions. Nor can this university increase the complement of its staff to assume a portion of the added burden brought about by the increase in the number of students. This is a sad state of affairs because this is bound to affect the work of our staff and also their morale".

We consider it one of the most urgent tasks of Council to exert its influence with the Minister in order to reverse this disastrous trend.

Table 2 - OBE High School Settlement

Salaries as of:

<u>Yrs. of Experience</u>	<u>A 74</u>	<u>B Jan-Aug 75</u>	<u>C Sep-Dec 75</u>	<u>% C/A</u>
0	\$ 8,900.	\$	\$	
1	10,615.	12,900.	13,400.	51 plus COLA
5	13,255.			
6	13,835.	17,400.	17,900.	35 plus COLA
10	16,200.			
11	16,810.	21,900.	22,400.	38 plus COLA
12	17,420.	21,900.	22,400.	33 plus COLA
13	18,030.	21,900.	22,400.	29 plus COLA
14	18,535.	21,900.	22,400.	24 plus COLA
Vice Principal				
0	20,535.			
1		25,010.	25,610.	25 plus COLA
2		25,820.	26,440.	
3	22,765.	26,860.	27,510.	21 plus COLA
Principals				
0	24,045.			
1		29,340.	30,050.	25 plus COLA
2		30,300.	31,030.	
3	26,795.	31,620.	32,380.	21 plus COLA

Plus: lump sum \$325.

Plus: \$500. for Masters and \$1,000 for Ph.D.

Plus: COLA from September 1976.

Average Salaries, 1971-72

	<u>Floor</u>	<u>New</u> <u>Appointments</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>Continuing</u> <u>Faculty</u>	<u>% Change</u>
Full Prof.	\$18,470.	\$24,033.	-	\$24,340.	-
Assoc. Prof.	13,940.	16,523.	-	17,956.	-
Asst. Prof.	10,660.	13,348.	-	14,378.	-
Lect.	8,670.	11,104.	-	11,778.	-
Overall				16,725.	-
CPI (July 1971)				134	-

Average Salaries, 1974-75

	<u>Floor</u>	<u>New</u> <u>Appointments</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>Continuing</u> <u>Faculty</u>	<u>% Change</u>
Full Prof.	\$21,540.	\$29,900.	24%	\$28,585.	17%
Assoc. Prof.	16,650.	19,917.	21%	20,861.	16%
Asst. Prof.	12,945.	15,540.	16%	17,025.	18%
Lect.	10,060.	13,234.	19%	14,105.	20%
Overall				20,645.	23%
CPI (July 1974)				168	25%

